DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 182 TM 005 038

AUTHOR Hsia, Jayjia

TITLE Planning and Developing 1974-75 Building Evaluation Prototypes Under ESEA Title I for the Minneapolis Board of Education Principals' Committee.

INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Evanston, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn.
REPORT NO ETS-PR-75-22
PUB DATE Nov 75
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Compensatory Education Programs; Elementary Education; *Elementary Schools; Evaluation Needs; Models; Parochial Schools; *Principals; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; *Minneapolis Public Schools; Minnesota (Minneapolis)

ABSTRACT

An evaluation committee of Minneapolis Board of Education Title I principals initiated the Minneapolis Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I Principals' Building Level Evaluation Project. The purpose of the project was: (1) to help the committee assess the evaluation needs of Minneapolis Title I principals; and (2) to study the feasibility of using alternative evaluation models for conducting building level evaluation. The five phases of the work plan were: (1) area meetings with Title I principals in Minneapolis North, East and West Areas, and from parochial schools, to determine interest in building level evaluation; (2) in-depth interviews with ESEA Title I principals who expressed interest in building level evaluation; (3) literature search for evaluation models relating to building level evaluation; (4) preparation of an evaluation "menu" consisting of a simple, nontechnical pamphlet designed to stimulate discussion on building level evaluation; and (5) preparation of a final report of the project. Through a series of meetings, questionnaires, and interviews, it was possible to ascertain the interests of Title I principals in building level evaluation. Their main areas of concern, in order of frequency, were: (1) overall program effects on pupils; (2) attitudes of staff, pupils, and parents toward the program; and (3) best allocation of Title I funds. (Author/BJG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED117182

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TM005 038

PR-75-22

PLANNING AND DEVELOPING 1974-75 BUILDING EVALUATION PROTOTYPES UNDER ESEA TITLE I

for the

MINNEAPOLIS BOARD OF EDUCATION

PRINCIPALS' COMMITTEE

Jayjia Hsia

November 1975

2

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

PLANNING AND DEVELOPING 1974-75 BUILDING EVALUATION PROTOTYPES UNDER ESEA TITLE I

for the

MINNEAPOLIS BOARD OF EDUCATION

PRINCIPALS' COMMITTEE

Jayjia Hsia

November 1975

Educational Testing Service
960 Grove Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201

CONTENTS

Section *Page*

TABLES AND LISTS . . . . . *iv*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . . *v*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . . *vi*

1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT 1

2. SCOPE OF THE PROJECT 3

Area Meetings
ESEA Title I Principal Interviews
Literature Search
Draft, Review, and Revision of Evaluation "Menu"
Final Report

3. RESULTS 5

Assessment of Building Level Evaluation Needs
Title I Principals' Area Meetings
Principal Interviews
A "Menu" of Evaluation Models

4. RECOMMENDATIONS 15

APPENDIX

Exhibit 1: Preliminary Principal Questionnaire . . . 22

Exhibit 2: Sample Letter(s) of Request for Principal Interview 23

Exhibit 3: Principal Interview Schedule 25

TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Frequency of Title I Principals' Responses Regarding Interest in Building Level Evaluation	5
2.	Frequency of Title I Principals' Responses Regarding Interest in Area and Type of Evaluation	6
3.	Frequencies of Central Office and Building Title I Programs in 20 Title I Elementary Schools	9
4.	Frequencies of Title I Principals' Responses Regarding Main Areas of Concern with Respect to Building Level Evaluation	10

LISTS

List		
1.	Priority Areas of Concerns in Building Level Evaluation (By Area In Alphabetic Order of Name of Principal)	14

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Acknowledgment is made of the fine cooperation received during the course of this study from members of the evaluation committee of the Minneapolis Board of Education Title I principals: Mr. George Haakenson, Principal of Bancroft School; Mr. Richard J. Hanson, Principal of Calhoun School; and Mr. Jack Ott, Principal of Lowell School; and from Dr. Richard W. Faunce, Director of the Department of Research and Evaluation, and other members of the department.

A sincere thank you goes to all the Title I principals who completed questionnaires and participated in the interviews on building level evaluation. The principals who were interviewed and their schools were: Mr. Bradley A. Bentson (Bryn Mawr), Mr. Sidney A. Buchanan (Northrop), Mr. Waldamar P. Buchanan (Irving), Mrs. Ann B. Danahy (Kenwood), Mr. Douglas B. Drolsum (Cleveland), Mr. Elmer G. Eckland (Clinton), Mr. Gordon Flattum (Standish), Mr. Bruce J. Gall (Greeley), Mr. Charles K. Gustafson (Webster Intermediate), Mr. George A. Haakenson (Bancroft), Ms. Mary Jane Higley (Holland), Sister Delores Leuer (St. Bridget's Parochial), Mrs. Margaret M. Lincoln (Madison), Mr. Charles McConville (Burroughs), Mr. George A. McDonough (Bethune), Mr. Paul M. Modell (Agassiz), Mr. Robert L. Monson (Seward), Mr. Theodore C. Pollard (Harrison), Mr. Duane F. Ramberg (North Area Learning Center), Mr. Kenneth Schumack (Corcoran).

An expression of appreciation is extended to Mr. Robert A. Reineke, ETS research staff member for the project in Minneapolis, and also to his secretary, Ms. Jeanene M. Noll.

Thank you also goes to Mrs. Annette Black and Mrs. Sylvia Slive who typed and assembled the final report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An evaluation committee of Minneapolis Board of Education Title I principals has been concerned with possibilities for conducting evaluation at the individual building level. Committee members perceive building level evaluation as a means for improving Title I programs, facilitating decision making, and encouraging the participation of staff, parents, and community members in educational planning and decision-making activities.

At a planning meeting in April, 1975, the committee initiated the Minneapolis ESEA Title I Principals' Building Level Evaluation Project. The purpose of the project, conducted by Educational Testing Service, was: (1) to help the committee assess the evaluation needs of Minneapolis Title I principals; and (2) to study the feasibility of using alternative evaluation models for conducting building level evaluation. The project involved cooperative activities by Title I principals, the Department of Research and Evaluation, and Educational Testing Service.

The work plan for the project was developed cooperatively and included five phases:

(1) Area meetings with Title I principals in Minneapolis North, East and West Areas, and from parochial schools, to determine interest in building level evaluation;

(2) In-depth interviews with ESEA Title I principals who expressed interest in building level evaluation;

(3) Literature search for evaluation models relating to building level evaluation;

(4) Preparation of an evaluation "menu" consisting of a simple, nontechnical pamphlet designed to stimulate discussion on building level evaluation; and

(5) Preparation of a final report of the project.

Through a series of meetings, questionnaires, and interviews, it was possible to ascertain the interests of Title I principals in building level evaluation. Their main areas of concern, in order of frequency, were: (1) overall program effects on pupils; (2) attitudes of staff, pupils, and parents toward the program; and (3) best allocation of Title I funds. The kinds of building level desired by Title I principals were, in rank order: (1) product evaluation of Title I programs; (2) formative evaluation of relatively new programs; (3) efficiency evaluation, such as a cost-effectiveness study; and (4) input evaluation, such as assessment of school resources.

The evaluation "menu" entitled, *About Building Level Evaluation*, was prepared following an intensive literature search on evaluation models. The pamphlet was reviewed by members of the Committee and the Department of Research and Evaluation, and was revised in accordance with suggestions received. The "menu" provides a general introduction to building level evaluation, presents and briefly explains some general evaluation models which could be applied at the building level, and provides an overview of activities and considerations in conducting building level evaluations.

Two building level evaluation studies are recommended for first year pilot evaluation projects. They are: (1) a pilot evaluation project emphasizing pupils' acquisition of basic skills, to follow a summative evaluation model; and (2) a pilot evaluation project with community participation which would focus on pupils' affective development, to follow a formative evaluation model. The final report suggests some possibilities for the design, instrumentation, and subjects for each of the two recommended pilot studies. The final report also suggests some guidelines for establishing an effective relationship between a Title I pilot evaluation school and an outside consultant.

Section 1

BACKGROUND OF THE PROJECT

ESEA Title I programs in the public schools of Minneapolis are monitored and evaluated systematically in accordance with federal guidelines. Evaluation, in general, has been conducted on a district-wide basis for the purpose of assessing overall impact of Title I projects. Relatively little attention has been paid to assessing Title I projects at the individual building level. Increasingly, principals of elementary schools which receive Title I funds have been expressing interest in conducting evaluation studies of compensatory educational projects initiated within their own schools.

In April, 1975, an evaluation committee of Minneapolis Title I principals* held a planning meeting to consider possibilities for developing one or more models for building level evaluation. Educational Testing Service, (ETS), a nonprofit educational research and measurement organization, was selected to help the committee in assessing evaluation needs of Minneapolis Title I principals and studying the feasibility of using alternative evaluation models.

Members of the evaluation committee felt that the purpose of building level evaluation would primarily be to provide timely and relevant information to Title I principals, faculty, and parents so that school-

---

*Mr. George Haakenson, Principal, Bancroft School
Mr. Richard J. Hanson, Principal, Calhoun School
Mr. Jack Ott, Principal, Lowell School

initiated projects could be continuously improved. They believed that such locally initiated, low profile evaluation studies could facilitate decision making without the threat of undue publicity which sometimes accompanies the widespread dissemination of citywide evaluation findings. Furthermore, the committee members perceived building level evaluations as being vehicles suitable for encouraging broad based participation in educational planning and decision making on the part of staff, parents, and interested community members. During the April 25th meeting, an action plan was drawn up for cooperative work on the part of Title I principals, the Department of Research and Evaluation, and ETS. The section on scope of work, which follows, describes the functions of each of the participating groups.

Section 2

SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

The work plan which resulted from the initial planning meeting of the evaluation committee, Department of Research and Evaluation, and ETS staff, defined the scope of the Minneapolis ESEA Title I Principals' Building Level Evaluation Project. The plan included the following steps:

(1) *Area Meetings.* During the month of May, group interviews would be held with Title I principals in the North, East, and West Areas of Minneapolis. During the course of the meetings, the purpose of the project would be described by the project director, and each Title I principal would be requested to complete a short questionnaire. The questionnaire asked each principal to indicate his or her interest in building level evaluation, and the kind of evaluation that might be particularly useful for Title I programs. The result of the Area meetings would be a preliminary list of principals with expressed interest in, and need for, building level evaluation of Title I projects.

(2) *ESEA Title I Principal Interviews.* A detailed interview schedule would be developed, based on the preliminary information gained from the Area meetings. Each Title I principal who expressed any degree of interest in the notion of building level evaluations would be interviewed. The purpose of the interviews would be to examine, in depth, the types of Title I projects initiated at the building level, and the kinds of evaluation Title I principals are considering. The result of the interviews would be a document which summarizes school initiated Title I programs, and the perceived need for Title I building level evaluations.

(3) *Literature Search.* A literature search on building level evaluation models would be conducted, including an ERIC computer-assisted search of recent publications. The purpose of the literature search would be to identify possible evaluation models which could be applied in the Minneapolis Title I elementary school setting. The results of the literature search, in combination with data from interviews and group meetings, would be a building level evaluation "menu." The concept of a "menu" of evaluation models was initiated by the evaluation committee. It was felt that a short, simply written, nontechnical pamphlet could be used by principals, faculty, parents, and community members as a starting point in exploring possibilities for evaluating school initiated projects.

(4) *Draft, Review, and Revision of Evaluation "Menu."* The building level evaluation "menu" would be written in draft form and circulated among members of the evaluation committee and staff of the Department of Research and Evaluation for comments. Revisions would be made in line with recommendations of the reviewers. The final evaluation "menu" would be printed to provide several copies for each interested Title I principal.

(5) *Final Report.* A final summary report would be prepared, describing the entire project. It would include the revised "menu" and recommendations for trial implementation of building level evaluation in the Minneapolis Title I elementary schools.

Section 3

RESULTS

Assessment of Building Level Evaluation Needs.

Of the 32 Title I elementary schools' and 5 Title I parochial schools' principals, how many would be willing to commit school resources and work cooperatively with the Department of Research and Evaluation or other evaluation specialists to conduct a pilot evaluation program? Through a series of meetings, questionnaires, and interviews, Title I principals were asked to indicate the extent and kinds of their evaluation needs.

(1) Title I Principals' Area Meetings

During the month of May, the project director met with Title I principals in East, North, and West areas as well as from Title I parochial schools. The purpose of the Building Level Evaluation project was described briefly, and each Title I principal was asked to complete a preliminary questionnaire (Exhibit 1 in Appendix) indicating whether there is interest in building level evaluation. Response frequencies are shown below.

Table 1

FREQUENCY OF TITLE I PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES REGARDING INTEREST IN BUILDING LEVEL EVALUATION

Area	Number of Title I Schools	"Interested" Principals	"Not Interested" Principals	"Undecided" Principals	"No Response" Principals
East	11	8			3
North	14	3	2		9
West	7			2	5
Parochial	5	5	—	—	—
Total	37	16	2	2	17

Which building level projects did the principals want to evaluate? And what kind of evaluation did they have in mind? A tally of responses to the preliminary questionnaire showed a broad range of interests, with emphasis in the basic skills areas: reading or language arts and arithmetic. Table 2 shows the frequency of responses to each category. It was not clear, however, whether the principals were concerned specifically with building-initiated Title I projects, or with the district-wide projects.

Table 2

FREQUENCY OF TITLE I PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES REGARDING INTEREST IN AREA AND TYPE OF EVALUATION

Area to be evaluated: / Type of Evaluation:	Input	Formative	Summative	Efficiency
Language Arts	1	1	2	-
Reading	-	2	3	-
Math Lab	-	1	4	-
Basic Skills	-	1	-	-
Career Awareness	-	-	1	-
Teacher Effectiveness	2	1	1	1
Aids Effectiveness	-	-	2	-
Open School	-	2	-	-
Social Studies	-	-	1	-
Science	-	-	1	-
Moral Development	-	-	1	-
Parent-Teacher Relations	-	1	-	-

(2) Principal Interviews

Soon after the Area meetings, letters were sent to each Title I principal, with the exception of two principals who were firm in stating they had no interest in building level evaluation. The

letters (Exhibit 2 in Appendix) described the purpose of the Title I principals' project, and requested their cooperation in exploring their interests and needs for evaluating building-initiated Title I projects. Telephone calls were made to each of the 35 Title I principals as followup to the letters. A total of 20 principals were interested enough in the notion of building level evaluations to consent to in-depth interviews. A detailed summary report of the interviews was submitted to the Department of Research and Evaluation in July. A summary of the interim report follows below.

Purpose of Principal Interviews. The semi-structured interviews with 20 Title I principals were intended to collect some answers to the following questions:

1. What are the specific building level evaluation needs in each building: who, what, when, where, and how do the principals want to evaluate?
2. What available data are there, which would be relevant to their evaluation needs, and what additional data will be necessary?
3. What is the level of understanding of the notion of building level evaluation, and how deep and broad are the evaluations they envision?
4. Who, in the principal's opinion, should share in the planning phase of any kind of building level evaluation?
5. To whom should building level evaluation findings be disseminated?

Instrumentation. A Principal Interview Schedule (Exhibit 3 in Appendix) was developed as guide to assessing the Title I principals' knowledge of and interest in building level evaluations. The interviews were conducted in a relaxed, informal atmosphere in their schools. Every effort was directed towards pursuing each principal's own evaluation interests and concerns. Ample opportunities were afforded each principal to express freely his own views and ask questions about evaluation at the building level as opposed to district-wide evaluation studies.

Interview Findings. Considerable variation was observed among the principals in terms of their levels of sophistication with regard to measurement and evaluation. There was some confusion as to which Title I projects were initiated by the school, and which were originated from the central office. It was also sometimes difficult to discriminate Title I sponsored components from non-Title I components of educational programs within schools. Interpretation of the principals' responses must therefore be made in the light of some of these observed ambiguities.

The kinds of evaluation desired by the principals were rank-ordered according to frequency of responses. Product evaluation of Title I programs was the top choice of these administrators. Formative evaluation of relatively new programs was also a popular request. Efficiency evaluation, such as the relative cost effectiveness of devoting Title I monies

to resource teachers versus teacher aides, was third. Input evaluation, the assessment of the resources of the schools, was last in terms of principal interest.

The relative numbers of Central Office programs and Building Level Programs according to principal reports in the 20 schools visited are shown below. It must be noted that the distinction between "central office" and "building" Title I programs was far from being clearly drawn. Any Title I evaluation conducted at the building level will probably involve assessing the total impact of Title I funds, regardless of the origins of the programs.

Table 3

FREQUENCIES OF CENTRAL OFFICE AND BUILDING TITLE I PROGRAMS IN 20 TITLE I ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Central Office Level		Building Level	
Program	Frequency	Program	Frequency
Instructional Resource Center	13	Teacher Aides	15
Mathematics	9	Resource Teachers	8
Basic Skills Center	8	Math (labs included)	14
Reading	8	Reading	12
Title I Resource Teachers	7	Clerical	3
Talking Typewriter	3	System 80	3
ABC	2	Modified Open School	1

The chief areas of concern with respect to building level evaluations varied among the respondents. Top priorities were given to overall program effects on students, attitudes of staff, students and parents toward programs, and the best allocation of Title I funds. Frequency of the principals' main concerns are listed below.

Table 4

FREQUENCY OF TITLE I PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES REGARDING MAIN CONCERNS FOR BUILDING LEVEL EVALUATIONS

Principals' Main Concerns		Frequency of Response
1. What is the overall effect of Title I Programs on students?		17
2. Attitudes toward Title I Programs:		15
a. Teachers/Aides	7	
b. Students	6	
c. Parents	2	
3. How should building level Title I funds be used (i.e., resource people, aides, etc.)?		9
4. Formative evaluation of Title I		6
5. Building-wide program evaluation		5
6. Staff development		3
7. Community involvement		4
8. Summative evaluation to justify building level Title I funds		2

The interviewed Title I principals were generous with their time, and candid and affirmative in expressing their needs and concerns. They were quite certain in "what," "who," and "when" they wanted in terms of building level evaluation. There was less certainty

in the issue of "how" such evaluation should proceed. They were agreed that an evaluation model that would work well at one school could be transported to similar programs at other schools. Their awareness of shared interests and common programs (at least in name) among some schools would work in favor of conducting a few pilot projects. Nor are the kinds of data presently available from each of the schools markedly different from each other. Many of the principals were looking to the possibility of a building level evaluation project as an opportunity for the administration, staff, and parents to learn and work together in cooperation with an evaluation specialist or coordinator from the central office. The findings of such a study would not necessarily be limited to the building, since a number of principals felt their programs would survive the scrutiny of an exacting assessment.

Given the willingness on the part of a number of principals to participate in a pilot building level evaluation project, it remains to decide what evaluation models might be feasible for the interested schools, how a pilot evaluation project could be undertaken, and what schools might be fruitful sites for a pilot project. If the level of enthusiasm about building level evaluation is a prime criterion for the choice of cooperating schools, the following two lists of schools and principals should be considered in hierarchical order.

(a) Principals who were enthusiastic about building level evaluation, and were primarily concerned with assessing basic skills:

School	Principal	Focus of Evaluation
Bancroft	Mr. Haakenson	Narrow focus, summative evaluation for accountability purposes
Webster Intermediate	Mr. Gustafson	Formative evaluation as diagnostic tool for staff, summative evaluation of total program
Burroughs	Mr. McConville	Formative and summative evaluation
Corcoran	Mr. Schumack	Formative and summative evaluation
Northrop	Mr. S. Buchanan	Formative evaluation of reading program

(b) Principals who were enthusiastic about building level evaluation, but were concerned with affective outcomes as well as basic skills:

School	Principal	Focus of Evaluation
Clinton	Mr. Eckland	Formative evaluation of open school, reactions of pupils, teachers, parents, community
Agassiz	Mr. Modell	Staff and student attitude, learning environment
Holland	Ms. Higley	Open school, evaluation of program

A "Menu" of Evaluation Models.

In addition to a survey of Title I principals' evaluation needs, a second building level evaluation aid which the Title I principals' committee requested was a brief "menu" describing various evaluation models which might be applicable to programs in their schools. The purpose of such a "menu" would be to serve as a starting point for discussions about building level evaluation among the principal, teachers, and interested parents, with the guidance of Department of Research and Evaluation professionals. While there would not be enough information on such a "menu" for the school themselves to design for themselves an evaluation study, there might be enough ideas to provoke a lively and informed discussion among interested parties.

Accordingly, a "menu" for stimulating appetites for building level evaluation was written after an extensive literature search, reviewed by committee members and Research and Evaluation staff, and revised in accordance with their suggestions. The "menu" was designed to provide a general introduction to building level evaluation, present and briefly explain some general evaluation models, and provide an overview of activities and considerations in conducting building level evaluations.

The library search and ERIC title search yielded an enormous amount of material in evaluation of compensatory education programs in general, a substantial number of publications devoted to evaluation models in particular, but a relative paucity of references on models for evaluating programs specifically at the building level. Of necessity, the little pamphlet, *About Building Level Evaluation*, dealt with general evaluation models which could be applied at the building level. Yet, because an elementary school is a self-contained microcosm, a well designed evaluation study may well yield more detailed and reliable local information than can be gained from the large scale district-wide evaluation efforts. The following section contains some recommendations for pilot projects to try out one or two evaluation models at cooperating schools.

The following list shows principals with shared areas of concern. Any product evaluation project which appears to be successful in one of the buildings would be transportable to the others with the same priority areas.

List 1

PRIORITY AREAS OF CONCERNS IN BUILDING LEVEL EVALUATION
(BY AREA IN ALPHABETIC ORDER OF NAME OF PRINCIPAL)

Priority Areas of Concerns/Schools	Name of Principal
1. Evaluation of Open School Programs	
Harrison	Mr. Bentson
Wilder	Mr. Eckland
Standish	Mr. Flattum
2. Comparative effectiveness of teacher aides, resource teachers, other ways of using Title I funds.	
Northrop	Mr. S. Buchanan
Irving	Mr. W. Buchanan
Kenwood	Mrs. Danahy
Standish	Mr. Flattum
Webster Intermediate	Mr. Gustafson
St. Bridget	S. Delores Leuer
Bethune	Mr. McDonough
Seward	Mr. Monson
Jefferson	Mr. Pollard
3. Attitude and Motivation among pupils, parents, teachers	
Cleveland	Mr. Drolsum
Madison	Mrs. Lincoln
Bethune	Mr. McDonough
Agassiz	Mr. Modell
North Area Learning Center	Mr. Ramberg
4. Mathematics Achievement	
Greeley	Mr. Gall
Webster Intermediate	Mr. Gustafson
Bancroft	Mr. Haakenson
Holland	Mr. Higley
St. Bridget	S. Delores Leuer
Madison	Mrs. Lincoln
Seward	Mr. Monson
5. Reading	
Bancroft	Mr. Haakenson
Longfellow	Mr. McConville
Agassiz	Mr. Modell
Seward	Mr. Manson

Section 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction.

The genuine interest shown by a majority of the Title I principals, the existence of common areas of interest among several buildings, and the availability of citywide and Title I assessment data combine together to suggest that relatively modest trial projects might have future applications to a number of Title I schools. The levels of knowledge manifested by the principals, however, indicate that substantial professional support would be needed from outside sources if valid and transportable building level evaluation model projects are to be developed.

If one or two pilot evaluations were to be carried out, what projects should be tried first? Who would bear the responsibility of the different components of the task? How can the work be divided between the building staff and community on the one hand, and the necessary outside professional consultant on the other? The following suggestions are based on the findings from the questionnaires and interviews. Realities of the educational scene in Minneapolis, however, will dictate whether even modest building level evaluation projects can be carried out. Ideally, an evaluator from Research and Evaluation would be assigned to a cooperating school, probably on a part-time basis. Since resources for such projects are limited in the schools as well as in the central office, the initial trial project(s) should be modest in scale. A pilot project must be very carefully designed and carried out so that the model can be applied to other schools if results warrant it. Help in evaluation design and instrumentation might also be explored from nearby universities or other outside sources.

Recommendations for Pilot Evaluation Projects.

Initially, no more than two pilot evaluation studies can be feasibly undertaken. The site of pilot evaluation projects should be selected on the basis of enthusiasm and commitment on the part of not only the principal, but of the staff and parents or community members as well. By keeping the pilot projects modest in scale and low in profile, it should be possible to try out the concept of building level evaluation without unduly penalizing the pioneer schools who volunteer to undertake building level evaluation.

It should be reasonable to assess pupil progress in two distinct dimensions during the first year pilot evaluation projects. One might concentrate on the acquisition of basic skills. The other might look primarily at affective variables, such as pupil attitudes to school, parental support of school goals and practices, community support, teacher attitude, or classroom climate. Some possibilities for design, instrumentation and samples for each of the two recommended pilot studies are discussed below.

(1) A pilot project with emphasis on evaluating the acquisition of basic skills would follow a summative evaluation model. Such a project would rely heavily on citywide standardized test data. Quality of the study would depend on the completeness and reliability of pupil records.

Design. An experimental or quasi-experimental design could be used in comparison with two or more ways of spending Title I monies at the school level. For example, it would be possible to compare achievement of pupils with classroom teachers and resource teachers in reading or math; and that of pupils with teachers and aides. It may also be

possible to compare achievement of pupils with teachers and aides in combination, with or without the additional tool of teaching machines. Decision on design will be dictated by the possibility for random assignment of individuals and classes to treatment, availability of control groups, and data files.

Subjects. In order to keep the project within manageable scale, limited classes of pupils in one or two grade levels should constitute the subjects of the pilot evaluation. If the decision is to conduct a longitudinal study, students in grades 5, 6, and 7, might be good choices, since annual citywide test data on the same instruments would be available from the past three years for many of the students.

Data sources. In addition to citywide test data, the Minneapolis Reading and Mathematics Criterion-Referenced Tests, if recorded with care, could be quantified for program evaluation purposes. Matched longitudinal data on individual pupils might be available from the Educational Service Center. Item analysis of group performance in specific achievement areas can yield useful information on the strengths and weaknesses of specific educational programs.

Major assistance requirements. Since completeness and accuracy of pupil achievement records are prime requirements for this pilot project, major effort should be devoted to making certain that pupil records are as complete as possible. Those with reading achievement test scores on instruments other than the Gates series might be included by using the Anchor Study tables to translate other reading test scores to Gates equivalent scores. A consistent method for quantifying and recording pupil progress with the Minneapolis Criterion-Referenced Tests would add depth

to the information available. Consultant assistance such as from Research and Evaluation would probably be necessary to set up a student information system, which can be continued with the help of clerical aides or volunteers in the cooperating schools. If a system could be developed to deliver longitudinal data on individual pupils, stored in the central files, the task of conducting longitudinal studies in a building would be lightened. Data analysis and interpretation could also require outside assistance. Here, too, systems developed for the pilot buildings should be applicable to other Title I schools with similar evaluation needs.

(2) A pilot evaluation project with community participation focusing on the affective development of pupils, based on a formative evaluation model. Such a pilot project would need substantial support from Research and Evaluation staff or other consultants in instrument design, staff, and community training, as well as design and data analysis.

Design. A quasi-experimental design using nonrandom comparison groups is a reasonable possibility. Several open schools are interested in some kind of building level evaluation in the affective domain. There are, in nearby locations, "contemporary" and "continuous progress" sister schools which serve similar populations. Since the Southeast Alternative Schools have had considerable experience in conducting formative evaluation of nontraditional settings, their experiences to date with design and instrumentation may be applicable to a Title I pilot school.

Subjects. In addition to pupils, school staff and parents can also be considered reasonable subjects for assessment of school climate and community relations. Again, the population to be considered should be severely limited. A thorough study of one or two grade levels, and selected classrooms would be preferable to a large school-wide effort.

Data Sources. Appropriate instruments, such as observation systems, questionnaires, or interview schedules, could be designed or adapted from other evaluation projects. A number of ETS bibliographies on measures of affective development are available for review from the Department of Research and Evaluation. It may be possible to conduct time consuming data collection, such as observations and interviews, with the assistance of volunteer parents or community members. A considerable training effort will be necessary for school evaluation volunteers, but results might be reaped in terms of improved community participation, as well as reliable data about human relations and attitudes to school.

Major assistance requirements. Substantial professional support will be needed to identify the specific affective areas to be evaluated, delimit the size of the study, design or adapt instruments needed, and train nonprofessional volunteers to collect data reliably. If parents and teachers are to have considerable control in the decision and implementation of such an evaluation, professional consultants may have to devote several meetings to explanations and question answering before a decision on building level evaluation can be reached. However, the resulting community participation model may be transportable to other schools.

Recommendations for Working Relationship Between Title I Pilot Evaluation School and Consultant.

Can an effective working relationship be established between a Title I pilot evaluation school and the outside consultant, such as an evaluation specialist from the Department of Research and Evaluation

or other source? A collaborative project should follow a number of simple guidelines:

(1) Emphasize continuous joint planning, and the establishment of direct and open communications between the school and the consultant, by designating an evaluation coordinator at the school, who will be the prime contact person.

(2) Devote initial meetings to the establishment of clearly delineated division of responsibilities between the school and the consultant which will result in each party contributing significantly to the pilot project.

(3) Everyone at the school who will be involved in the pilot project should have a thorough understanding of the purpose and procedures involved in the proposed building level evaluation.

(4) Make provisions for early decisions on evaluation design and instrumentation, so that data collection can be spaced during the school year, and results can provide effective feedback for program improvement.

(5) Analysis and interpretation of findings will be held in confidence between evaluator and the cooperating school. Decision on dissemination should be left in the hands of the building principal.

Exhibit 1

(PRELIMINARY PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE)

EVALUATION INTEREST QUESTIONNAIRE

Principal _____ School _____ Area _____

1. Have you undertaken any building level evaluation, now or in the past? If your answer is yes, please give a brief description of the project(s) and the evaluation design.

2. Have you programs or projects initiated at the building level that you would like to evaluate?
If your answer is yes, please list and give brief description of the program(s).

Title	_____	_____	_____
Location	_____	_____	_____
Grades served	_____	_____	_____
# pupils served	_____	_____	_____
# years in operation	_____	_____	_____

3. What kinds of evaluation would interest you the most? Please rank the four types listed below from 1 (most desirable) to 4 or 5 (least desirable).

_____ Input evaluation: assessing the level of resources and effort put into the project.

_____ Formative evaluation: assessing and evaluating the process or the way the project is implemented, for project improvement.

_____ Product evaluation: evaluating the end results of a project, to see if the goals have been attained.

_____ Efficiency evaluation: evaluating the relationship of the results of a project to the costs incurred, to assess the cost effectiveness of a project.

_____ Other (please specify):

Exhibit 2(A)

SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE EVANSTON OFFICE

Area Code 312
869-7700

May 29, 1975

Dear Mr.

Last week, I had a chance to meet with you during the Area Title I principals' meeting. At that time, you had expressed interest in exploring the possibilities for building level evaluations.

As a second step of the Principals' Committee project on developing models for building level evaluation, interviews will be conducted with every interested Title I principal. ETS, a non-profit organization devoted to measurement, evaluation and research in education, has been contracted by the Minneapolis Board of Education to work with the Principals' Committee. During the next week or two, you will be contacted by my colleague, Bob Reineke. We would be very grateful if you could consider, in the meantime, your own building evaluation needs for next year in terms of the following:

1. The kind of evaluation you prefer.
2. The program(s) you would like to evaluate.
3. The data available and the data needed for your building.
4. The people in your school or community who should be involved in the planning and data collection phases of any evaluation to be undertaken.
5. To whom the findings of any evaluation should be reported.

Mr. Reineke will explore these issues with you during a brief interview at your convenience. We hope to come up with several evaluation models which would address the specific evaluation needs of the Title I principals.

Sincerely yours,

Jayjia Hsia, Ph.D.
Director

sks

960 GROVE STREET · EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

Exhibit 2(B)

SAMPLE LETTER OF REQUEST FOR PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE EVANSTON OFFICE

Area Code 312
869-7700

May 29, 1975

Dear Mr.

Last week, I had a chance to meet with a number of Title I principals during the area principals' meetings. Perhaps you attended the meeting, and did not complete the short form concerning your interest in exploring possibilities for building level evaluation (a copy is enclosed for your information).

A number of Title I principals have indicated that they had specific evaluation projects in mind for next year. What about Clinton School? Have you planned programs or activities next year that you might like to evaluate?

As a second step of the Principals' Committee project on developing models for building level evaluation, interviews will be conducted with every interested Title I principal. ETS, a non-profit organization devoted to measurement, evaluation and research in education, has been contracted by the Minneapolis Board of Education to work with the Principals' Committee. During the next week or two, you will be contacted by my colleague, Bob Reineke. We would be very grateful if you could consider, in the meantime, your own building evaluation needs for next year in terms of the following:

1. The kind of evaluation you prefer.
2. The program(s) you would like to evaluate.
3. The data available and the data needed for your building.
4. The people in your school or community who should be involved in the planning and data collection phases of any evaluation to be undertaken.
5. To whom the findings of any evaluation should be reported

Mr. Reineke will explore these issues with you during a brief interview at your convenience. We hope to come up with several evaluation models which would address the specific evaluation needs of the Title I principals.

Sincerely yours,

Jayjia Hsia, Ph.D.
Director

sks
Enclosure

960 GROVE STREET · EVANSTON, ILLINOIS 60201

Principal Interview Schedule

Date _____

1. Principal _____ School _____ Area ____

A. Background and Building Data

1. Number of years as principal of this school: _____ Years

2. Building Parameters (75-76 estimate):

a. Number of students _____

b. Number of teachers _____

c. Support staff (professional) _____

d. Support staff (non-professional) _____

3. What Title I programs in school?

a. Sponsored and initiated by central office

Title _____

Date Began _____

Continue 75-76? ____ Yes ____ No

(1) Number of students involved _____

(2) Number of teachers involved _____

(3) Number of support personnel _____

b. Building level or cooperative (description)

Title _____

Date Began _____

Description _____

(1) Number of students involved _____

(2) Number of teachers involved _____

(3) Number of support personnel _____

B. Evaluation Requirements (Building Level)

1. Have you been involved in evaluation activities. ____ Yes ____ No

2. Approaching evaluation from the point of view of providing information for decision making, what information requirements do you have?
   (a) What kinds of data would facilitate your school decisions?
   (b) What information might other audiences find helpful or be apt to ask you about?

Audience	Priority	Decisions/Concerns	Information Requirements	Now Available (Yes-No)
Principal (as they relate to principal)				
Teachers				
Students				
Community				
Supt./Board				
State				
Federal				

TABLE L; Principal-Audience Information Matrix

Exhibit 3 - continued

2. Describe current in-house evaluative procedures:

3. To what extent are internal and external evaluation requirements compatible (overlap)?

4. In view of your concerns/decisions and attendant information requirements, what kind of evaluation effort would you envision which might best serve those needs?

5. To what extent to you feel that your evaluation requirements are similar to those of other K-6 schools? Cooperative programs? Which schools?

6. To what extent are community groups involved in Title I programs? To what extent should they be involved?

C. Evaluation Barriers

1. What potential barriers do you feel would need to be overcome in order to implement a building level evaluation which adequately would serve your decision needs? How might each be handled?

   a. Free response:

Barrier	How Handled

b. Prompt

Barrier	Yes-No	How Handled
(1) Teacher resistance	_____	_____
(2) Student resistance	_____	_____
(3) Lack of trained personnel	_____	_____
(4) External control requirements	_____	_____
(5) Insufficient time available	_____	_____
(6) Lack of data collection/ analysis capability	_____	_____
(7) External reporting requirements	_____	_____

2. Who do you feel might properly share in the planning and conduct of a building level evaluation?

List:

3. What external services do you think would be required to successfully implement a building level evaluation plan in your school?

a. Free response:

b. Prompt	Yes-No	No. of days required/mo.
(1) Planning consultant	_____	_____
(2) Data analysis capability	_____	_____
(3) Externally developed data collection instruments	_____	_____
(4) Evaluation director	_____	_____
(5) Evaluation coordinator	_____	_____
(6) Evaluation resource person	_____	_____

D. Dissemination of Findings

1. To whom should evaluation findings be disseminated?

a. Free response

b. Prompt

Audience	Amount of Information
Principal	_____
Teachers	_____
Students	_____
Parents	_____
Superintendents	_____
Board	_____
State government	_____
Federal government	_____
Research	_____

2. Who should decide to whom and to what extent results are distributed?

E. Assuming adequate resources were available, when would it be feasible to begin a building level evaluation at your school? and what specific Title I program would you want to assess?